| | Case 2:14-cv-00283-GMN-NJK | Document 56 | Filed 11/17/14 | Page 1 of 1 |
|----|--|-------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| | | | | |
| 1 | | | | |
| 2 | | | | |
| 3 | | | | |
| 4 | | | | |
| 5 | | | | |
| 6 | | | | |
| 7 | | | | |
| 8 | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT | | | |
| 9 | DISTRICT OF NEVADA | | | |
| 10 | CATHY TARR, et al., | | , | |
| 11 | Plaintiff(s), | |))) Case No | 2:14-cv-00283-GMN-NJK |
| 12 | | |) | DENYING MOTION |
| 13 | vs. NARCONON FRESH START, | |) TO STAY | |
| 14 | Defendant(s |) |) (Docket N | Jo. 52) |
| 15 | | ·)· | 3 | |
| 16 | Pending before the Court is Plaintiffs' motion to stay pending ruling on motion to transfer | | | |
| 17 | and consolidate case for multidistrict litigation. Docket No. 52. The Court has considered Plaintiffs' | | | |
| 18 | motion, Defendant's response, and Plaintiffs' reply. Docket No. 52, 54, 55. Upon review, the | | | |
| 19 | motions appear to be based upon the misunderstanding that there are no pending motions in this case. | | | |
| 20 | See Docket No. 54, at 7 ("[T]here are no pending motions in this case"); Docket No. 55, at 1 | | | |
| 21 | ("Plaintiffs agree with [Defendant's] position."). There are, however, two pending dispositive | | | |
| 22 | motions. See Docket Nos. 6, 20. Accordingly, Plaintiffs' motion to stay is DENIED without | | | |
| 23 | prejudice. | | | |
| 24 | IT IS SO ORDERED. | | | |
| 25 | DATED: November 17, 2014 | | | |
| 26 | | | | |
| 27 | NANCY J. KOPPE | | | |
| 28 | | | States Magistrate | Judge |
| | T . | | | |